

EDMS FCG

ACMS Status Meeting

24 - 26 February 1998

Summary of Meeting

On the 24th through the 26th of February 1998, the Army Materiel Command (AMC) Engineering Data Management (EDMS) Functional Coordinating Group (FCG) held a meeting at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Edgewood, MD. Mr. Mike Cantrell, CBDCOM/ERDEC, hosted the meeting. The meeting's purpose was to review and revise the draft *Performance Specification, Automated Configuration Management System (ACMS)*, dated 11 February 1998.

Mr. Gordon Ney from the U.S. Army Material System Analysis Activity (AMSAA) chaired the meeting. Approximately 20 representatives from the various Major Subordinate Commands (MSCs) and depots attended the meeting. Appendix A provides a list of attendees. Mr. Cantrell demonstrated CBDCOM's recently implemented Product Data Management System (PDM) system on the last day. No presentations were given at the meeting; however, copies of all the pdf files associated with the review can be obtained at the EDMS FCG homepage:

(http://www-iea.ria.army.mil/ai/eng_data/).

Opening Remarks

Mr. Ney opened the meeting on Tuesday, February 24, 1998 by welcoming the attendees. He then observed that, while many comments were provided against the draft ACMS Performance Specification, the comments and requirements were converging. Mr. Ney noted that the resulting requirements and operational concept information (appendices of the Performance Specification) represent the Army's definition of the target ACMS.

Mr. Ney also noted that several high-level issues remained to be resolved. These include the following:

- 1) Determining whether the document should be a performance specification that allows tailoring or a guidance specification.
- 2) Increasing the level of coordination with the PM and Logistics communities.
- 3) Deciding what organization should take ownership of the document (this question has been posed to AMC HQ).
- 4) Rescheduling of the meeting with Ms. Renata Price, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff, Research, Development and Acquisition, Science and Technology, to develop a strategy for achieving the target ACMS capabilities.
- 5) Examining the economics of Continuity of Operations Plans (COOPs) in light of individual site implementations of ACMS.

Mr. Ney requested that representatives from all the commands attend the meeting with Ms. Price once it is scheduled.

Document Review

For two days, February 24th and 25th, the ACMS Task Force reviewed and revised the paragraphs and requirements contained in the draft ACMS Performance Specification which were affected by one or more comments. On Tuesday, the group reviewed the General comments and those against Sections 1 and 2 of the draft Performance Specification. A portion of Section 3 was reviewed as well; stopping for the day with requirement number 3.1.1.1.6.3. The Task Force started again on Wednesday, February 25th, with requirement 3.1.1.2.1.1. The remainder of Section 3 was discussed on Wednesday, as were Sections 4 and

ACMS Status Meeting

24 - 26 February 1998

5.

The results of the two days of review are contained in a comments database that was updated in real-time as decisions were made. Additionally, Appendix B of these minutes contains approximately 100 detailed actions that came out of the review. Together, these sources provide a record of what review decisions were made at the meeting.

The comments database contains the requirements as they were stated going into the review, the resulting resolutions in the form of restated requirements, and cryptic explanations or justifications for the resolutions. The comments database also contains each comment that was submitted by the Government, BDM Federal, or CIMdata. When printed in report form, the comments database is over 500 pages in length.

A copy of the comments database will be provided to AMSAA on 31 March 1998 at the conclusion of BDM's work on the ACMS Performance Specification. Delivery of the updated ACMS Performance Specification to AMSAA is scheduled for 13 March 1998.

Key Observations, Issues, and Decisions from the February 1998 Meeting

Thursday morning, 26 February 1998, a document review wrap up session was held. A special guest, Mr. Steve French from SARDA and chairperson of the Paperless Office IPT, attended and provided valuable insight. The following list summarizes the key observations, issues, and decisions from the wrap up session and two days of review. Refer to Appendix B, Action Items Resulting from Meeting, and the comments database for other decisions made at the meeting.

Observations:

1) Two Types of Core ACMS Requirements. The ACMS Task Force members concluded that there are two types of core ACMS requirements. Those that are identical for each command and those that are of the same genre, but may be satisfied in many different ways without affecting any other ACMS site or set of users. Viewers and reports are examples of the latter type of core requirement. Every command needs at least one viewer within its ACMS implementation, but the selection of the viewer may be command specific. Similarly, every command needs to be able to generate reports, but each command may want to specify its own report formats and content.

2) Performance Specifications Define Standard Systems. As a result of a comment provided by CIMData, Inc., the ACMS Task Force members concluded that a performance specification is intended to define the performance requirements for a standard system. Uncontrolled tailoring of the requirements by implementing organizations would invalidate this document as a performance specification.

3) Army Leadership Expectations. Mr. French stated that the Army leadership is expecting Army acquisition organizations to transition to digital data operations by the year 2002. The leadership is looking to the ACMS Task Force to identify and describe an automated configuration management system for the Army. The leadership has the perception that there is enough commonality in the Army's configuration management community that an Army configuration management system should be achievable without much effort or funding.

4) Digitization by 2002 is a Journey. Mr. French speculated that the Army's data management problems will not be solved by the year 2002. The solution must be seen as an evolutionary journey. The position by the Army leadership that the problems can be solved without financial help is based on a lack of understanding of the issues. This lack of understanding is partly because groups such as the ACMS Task Force have not adequately explained the issues, sold their solutions, or developed effective implementation plans.

5) User Community View. Mr. Don Smith from Red River Army Depot indicated that the MSCs acting as islands of automation is a nightmare. Depots must support systems for 25 years or more. They need one way to obtain data. Foreign Military Sales support only lengthens the time in which systems must be supported. Program Managers (PMs) and MSCs must plan on supporting the full life cycle and should not see themselves as unique entities. The Army should not even see itself as unique. They must look at

ACMS Status Meeting

24 - 26 February 1998

Joint needs. DLA considerations need to be introduced. For example, a DLA part number does not correlate to the part numbers assigned by the PMs or technical data managers.

6) Wider Coordination Required. The ACMS Task Force recognized that additional coordination with the PM and logistics communities are necessary.

7) Task Force Policy and Funding Recommendation. Mr. French challenged the ACMS Task Force to better articulate what policy and funding positions are needed from the Army leadership. Four policy and funding positions were suggested, but not discussed or agreed to:

- A standard system with controlled tailoring.
- A standard interface based on MIL-STD-2549.
- A single Army implementor.
- A single source of funding.

Issues:

1) ACMS Will Be Expensive. Representatives of the ACMS Task Force were polled to offer their opinions as to the quality and utility of the ACMS Performance Specification. The poll showed that the document was considered to be an excellent product that fully defined the Army's enterprise need for the future. Implementing the ACMS describe by the Performance Specification, however, would require substantial resources in terms of funds, talent, and infrastructure.

2) Only Two Commands Have Sufficient Resources to Implement. Only two commands have the resources and talent to implement the ACMS described by the draft ACMS Performance Specification, AMCOM and TACOM. Others such as CBDCOM, SSCOM, STRICOM, and IOC would need both funding and the support of a separate implementation organization.

3) MIL-STD-2549 and JCALS Workflow Manager Seen as Burdens by Some. Some commands see the MIL-STD-2549 and JCALS Workflow Manager interface requirements as burdens that they cannot fulfill without funding. They note that MIL-STD-2549 is an untested standard that is not widely supported by commercial products.

4) MIL-STD-2549 Treatment of Revisions and Versions. MIL-STD-2549 describes a 1-tiered scheme for designating changes to documents and document representations. The terms revision and version are functionally equivalent, although version is used only in conjunction with software and revision is used for all other types of documents. An action was assigned to investigate the issue with the DoD CMAG and decide whether the Army should recommend a change to MIL-STD-2549.

Decisions:

1) Tailoring Will Be Restricted and Controlled. Tailoring of the ACMS Performance Specification will be restricted and controlled as described in Section 6 of the document. In particular, requirements will be designated as Enterprise-wide Requirements, Enterprise-unique Requirements, and Command-unique Requirements. Enterprise-wide Requirements must be satisfied by all systems in the ACMS federated system of systems. Enterprise-unique Requirements may be modified to accommodate site uniqueness within the constraints established by the ACMS Performance Specification (for example, only interfaces relevant to the site need be implemented). Command-unique Requirements relevant to a particular site, but may be satisfied by the ACMS hardware and software implemented at that site.

2) All Start as Enterprise-wide Requirements. Initially, all requirements in the ACMS Performance Specification will be designated as Enterprise-wide Requirements. The decision to move a requirement to one of the other two categories will be made by the EDMS FCG. Two-thirds of the FCG must vote in favor of a move for a requirement to be moved. Voting members will be the FCG Principles as identified by the EDMS FCG Chairperson.

3) Verification Methods. After a quick review by experts from TECOM, the ACMS Task Force decided to replace the verification methods described in the draft ACMS Performance Specification (Demonstration, Test, Inspection, and Analysis) with those proposed by AMCOM (Test, Evaluation, and

ACMS Status Meeting

24 - 26 February 1998

Analysis). It was also decided that the following requirements should be added to Section 4 of the Performance Specification. "The contractor shall develop detailed test procedures for each implementation site to verify that the requirements listed in Table I have been satisfied. All contractor test procedures shall be subject to Government approval. The contractor shall allow and assist the Government in monitoring contractor testing."

4) Another Review Is Required. The ACMS Task Force decided that at least one more review would be required before the ACMS Performance Specification will be final.

5) Include Content Required for Acquisition Documents. The following reminders for subsequent acquisition document should be included in Section 6:

- Include a statement requiring that current technologies provide the basis for the initial ACMS implementation, that the vendor presents a strategy for integrating new and improved technologies, and that the vendor plan for technology refresh in future ACMS releases.
- Provide complete technical definitions of interfaces required in External Interface Requirements paragraph. This includes technical definitions for interfaces with JEDMICS and JCALS Workflow Manager.
- Define conditions under which the identified applications can be launched.
- Define site specific requirements for recovery from catastrophic failures.
- Provide complete technical definitions of reports required for the local implementation of ACMS.
- Provide a Government Concept of Operations (GCO) at the time of solicitation. The GCO must be used to tailor the Enterprise-unique and Command-unique Requirements listed in Section 6. The GCO may need updating at the time of delivery and installation.
- Provide site specific requirements and technical definitions for converting and loading legacy data into ACMS vault(s).

6) Identify Long-Term Requirements. Identify in a table in Section 6 those long-term requirements that may not be satisfied until the year 2002.

7) Include Implementation Recommendations. Include the following set of implementation recommendations in Section 6:

- Review the "state-of-the-art" and "state-of-the-industry" for electronic signatures prior to implementing the electronic approval and sign-off requirements. This review should include any DoD approved or recognized Government, international, and industry electronic signature standards that are approved at the time of implementation.
- Determine whether launching third party COTS viewers and browsers, using embedded viewers and browsers, or both are acceptable means of satisfying requirements the imaging services requirements.
- Coordinate with other commands to standardize interfaces, application launching conditions, reports specifications, and legacy data conversions and loading in the event that two or more commands select the same PDM product as the foundation for their local implementation of ACMS.
- Investigate specific requirements in their implementations that may be needed to print images and redlines.

8) Use the "Phrase Electronic Forms." The ACMS Task Force agreed to use the phrase "electronic forms" when the Performance Specification was describing a structured presentation of product data on a computer screen that is used to modify or enter that data. An example is an engineering change action electronic form.

ACMS Status Meeting

24 - 26 February 1998

9) Replace “Weapon System.” The ACMS Task Force decided “weapon system” and “end item” should be replaced with “Army product” or “Army program” where appropriate.

CBDCOM PDM System Demonstration

On Thursday afternoon, 26 February 1998, Mr. Cantrell demonstrated CBDCOM’s PDM system. The system is based on Workgroup Technology’s CMS commercial product.

Walk-Through ACMS Briefing for Army Leadership

Following Mr. Cantrell demonstration, Mr. Ney walked the ACMS Task Force members through a set of draft slides. Mr. Ney was seeking and received constructive comments on what he should present to the Army leadership about ACMS and the work of the Task Force.

Date, Time, Location and Purpose of Next ACMS Task Force Meeting

DATE: 19 to 21 May 1998.

LOCATION: HQ AMC, Room 1S08.

PURPOSE OF MEETING:

- 1) To review Table III in Section 6 of the ACMS Performance Specification to decide in which column the requirement should be placed.
- 2) To brief the ACMS Performance Specification to Ms. Renata Price, ADCS RDA for Science and Technology.

Appendix A

Meeting Attendees

Name	Organization/ Office Symbol	E-mail	Phone Com/DSN	Fax Com/DSN
Booker, Ms Gayle	PM EDMS, Redstone Arsenal, AL AMSAM-CIC-ED-P	gayles@redstone.army.mil	(205) 842-8277 788-8277	(205) 842-7360 788-7360
Cantrell, Michael	CBDCOM-ERDEC	Mrcantre@cbdcom.apge.army.mil	(410) 671-5587	
Cox, Mr. James	BDM	jcox@bdm.com	(703) 848-6739	(703) 848-6198
Craff, Mr. Alberto	TACOM-ACALA, Rock Island, IL AMSTA-AC-AP	acraff@ria-emh2.army.mil	(309) 782-4115 793-4115	(309) 782-4990 793-4990
Crawford, Ms Carla	AMCOM-MRDEC, Redstone Arsenal, AL AMSAM-RD-SE-TD-	carlac@repos.redstone.army.mil	(205) 842-9821 788-9821	(205) 842-6119 788-6119
Dorchak, Mr. Ed	BDM	edorchak@bdm.com	(703) 848-5740	(703) 848-6198
Edwards, Mr. Andy	GRIZZLY, Warren, MI SFAE-GCSS-CM	edwardsa@cc.tacom.army.mil	 786-7967	
Ensenat, Mr. Wil	IOC, Rock Island, IL AMSIO-SME-A	wensenat@ria-emh2.army.mil	(309) 782-5175 793-5175	
French, Mr. Steve	SARDA- Programs and Evaluation	frenchs@sarda.army.mil	703/604-7238	
Goodwin, Mr. Charlie	STRICOM-AMSII-EO, Orlando, FL AMSTI-EO	goodwinc@stricom.army.mil	(407) 384-3916 970-3916	(407) 384-3888
Martinez, Ms Patricia	TACOM-WRN, Warren, MI AMSTA-TR-E/EDI	martinep@cc.tacom.army.mil	(810) 574-6067 786-6067	(810) 574-5666 786-5666
McGlone, Mr. Steven	AMSAA, Rock Island, IL AMXSY-T	smcglo@ria-emh2.army.mil	(309) 782-6521 793-6521	(309) 782-7170 793-7170
Meinhart, Mr. Robert	TACOM-ARDEC (Benet), Watervliet Arsenal, NY AMSTA-AR-CCB-EC	meinhart@pica.army.mil	(518) 266-4102 974-4102	(518) 266-3624 974-3624
Murter, Ms. Lisa	ATC-TECOM	emurter@atc.army.mil	(410) 278-9484 298-9484	
Ney, Mr. Gordon	AMSAA, Rock Island, IL AMXSY-T	gney@ria-emh2.army.mil	(309) 782-6586 793-6586	(309) 782-7170 793-7170

Appendix A

Meeting Attendees

Name	Organization/ Office Symbol	E-mail	Phone Com/DSN	Fax Com/DSN
Pepper, Mr. John	AMCOM-MRDEC, Redstone Arsenal, AL AMSAM-RD-SE-TD	jpepper@redstone.army.mil	(205) 876-5003 788-5003	(205) 842-6119 746-6119
Rice, Mr. Kenneth	SSCOM-NRDEC	krice@natick-emh2.army.mil	(508) 233-4271 256-4271	
Rickenbaugh, Mr. James	PM EDMS (NCCIM)	rickenbaugh-jw@redstone.army.mil	(314) 274-4792	
Santa Cruz, Ms. Sandy	BDM	ssantacr@bdm.com	(703) 848-6452	(703) 848-6198
Schneider, Mr. Tom	AMSAA, Rock Island, IL AMXSY-T	tschne@ria-emh2.army.mil	(309) 782-7794 793-7794	(309) 782-7170 793-7170
Smith, Mr. Donald	RRAD, Texarkana, TX SIORR	dlsmith@redriverad-emh1.army.mil	(903) 334-3823	(903) 334-4311 829-4311
Troche, Mr. Jose	CECOM-LRC, Ft. Monmouth, NJ AMSEL-LC-LEO-E-	troche@doim6.monmouth.army.mil		
Williamson, Ms Debbie	Radian, Inc.	debwill@redstone.army.mil	(205) 313-1682	
Yabloncky, Mr. Tony	SSCOM-NRDEC	ayablioni@natick-emh2.army.mil	(508) 233-4883	

Appendix B

Action Items Resulting from Meeting

Action No.	Action Category	Action Description	Actionee
1	Section 6	<p>Include reminder that technical definitions of interfaces must be included in acquisition documentation.</p> <p>See also Action 14, 55, 57, 60, and possibly 27 and 46.</p> <p>See s6words.doc.</p>	BDM
2	Glossary	<p>Review definitions of revision and version in Glossary.</p> <p>Make sure revision wording includes notion of released and working data (effectively another statement of the 1-tiered scheme).</p> <p>Examine document to ensure it describes 1-tier scheme. TF accepted this scheme for next BDM publication. If version is not mentioned, remove it from Glossary. See action 3.</p>	BDM
3	Section 1	Remove paragraph 1.2.6 to include 1.2.6-1 through 1.2.6-12.	BDM
4	Section 1	<p>Add a new bullet: 1.2.1- 4.</p> <p>ACMS will provide Army with a Year 2000 compliant configuration and product data management capability.</p>	BDM
5	Document	Search document for “weapon system” and “end item.” Refer to resolution of 1.2.4- 16 and G-25. Replace with “Army product” or “Army program” where appropriate.	BDM
6	Section 3	<p>Delete 3.1.1.1.2. 4 (old), Provide Rule- Based Access Control, and recreate as 3.1.1.7.1.8-1 after 3.1.1.7.1.8 (old), Tailor User’s Role and Group Permissions.</p> <p>Revise Justification text to explain that this is a move.</p>	BDM
7	Glossary	<p>Define "promoted product data" in Glossary.</p> <p>Refer to 3.1.1.1.2. 5 justification and pdf notes (feb29nts.pdf).</p>	BDM
8	Section 3	<p>Search document for uses of “partition.” Expect to remove any uses of “partition” unless there is a good reason that is independent of the 3.1.1.1.2.6 to 3.1.1.1.2.8 series of requirements.</p> <p>After edits, no occurrences.</p>	BDM
9	Glossary	<p>Remove “logical partition” from Glossary and define “logical location.”</p> <p>Refer to 3.1.1.1.2.7 pdf note.</p>	BDM
10	Section 3	<p>Delete 3.1.1.1.3.1 (old) and recreate as 3.1.1.1.5.3 (a new number in the old sequence). Essentially moving 3.1.1.1.3.1 (old) to creating a new requirement 3.1.1.1.5.3.</p> <p>Change the text to read, "ACMS shall provide the capability to update metadata."</p> <p>Change the title of 3.1.1.1.5 (old) to "Release and Metadata Management Requirements."</p>	BDM

Appendix B

Action Items Resulting from Meeting

Action No.	Action Category	Action Description	Actionee
11	Section 3	Revise 3.1.1.1.4.3 (non-host) requirements parallel with 3.1.1.1.4.1 (host) requirements. Effects 3.1.1.1.4.4 and 3.1.1.1.4.5 as well. Note that these are no longer deleted as indicated in the resolution text. We need to work these host and non-host requirements together.	BDM
12	Section 3	Provide revised wording for 3.1.1.1.4.6. In the absence of another suggestion, BDM- will add the following sentence to the end of the requirement as discussed at the feb 98 meeting. Booker requested the action to find other words. “In particular, a user will be able to query on a part and find where that part is used in all higher level assemblies and CIs.” Revise 3.1.1.1.4.7 to be consistent, if necessary. BDM amended sentence to reflect Booker request.	Primary: Booker Secondary: BDM--
13	Section 3	Delete 3.1.1.1.4. 9 (old) and recreate, as revised at feb 98 mtg, to in front of 3.1.1.1.4.8 (old) (i.e., recreate as 3.1.1.1.4.7-1). Essentially moving the requirement.	BDM
14	Section 6	Include reminder that the implementing organization should review the “state-of-the-art” and “state-of-the-industry” for electronic signatures prior to implementing requirement 3.1.1.1.5.1 (old), Support Electronic Approvals, and 3.1.1.2.2.10, Provide Electronic Sign- off. See s6words.doc.	BDM
15	Section 3	Make sure that check-in and check-out are covered in 3.1.1.1.6.1, Record Audit History, given 3.1.1.1.6.3 is being deleted. Added document transport transactions to the audit history. May want to consider changing to product data transport.	BDM
16	Section 3	Review Buyer's Guide for intent. Original the set of requirements dealing with copying or moving files from a secure data storage to users workspace, and then recording the actual data transport transactions associated with the file movements (P6.1.6). See 3.1.1.1.6.3. Note. Do not use term transaction log. We already use that for other purposes. Note. 3.1.1.1.6.1 needs to make sure that check-in and check-out are covered (Action 15).	BDM
17	Section 3	Add time-out rules to Glossary. The following is the sentence removed from 3.1.1.2.1.4. It provides the beginning of a definition for time-out rules. “Time-out rules are also known as escalation rules.”	BDM

Appendix B

Action Items Resulting from Meeting

Action No.	Action Category	Action Description	Actionee
18	Section 6	Keep 3.1.1.2.2.1 and 3.1.1.2.2.1-1 (workflow progress and resources) as one requirement and show it as a current requirement. Do not include it in the Section 6 Table.	BDM
19	Glossary	Add workflow to Glossary. Be sure to include the notion of routing the product data. May want to use the definition of workflow capabilities as the starting point.	BDM
20	Section 3	Add an example to 3.1.1.1.2.2 that makes sure workflow modification authorization is suppressed for unauthorized users. See pdf notes.	BDM
21	Glossary	Modify Product Structure definition in Glossary as follows per the pdf note attached to 3.1.1.3.1.8: “A hierarchical collection of parts, components, or assemblies. May include CIs and the highest level element such as the weapon system or end item, or the lowest level element such as a part. A product structure often is represented as a graphical depiction of the relationships among product structure elements.”	BDM
22	Section 3	Provide appropriate references for MIL-HDBK-881.	SSCOM, Yablonsky.
23	Section 2	Add MIL-HDBK-881 to list of Section 2 references.	BDM
24	Section 3	Determine if 3.1.1.4.1 is to be a future or current requirement. No direction was provided at feb 98 mtg. Deals with the one remaining WBS requirement.	ACMS Task Force (probably Ney or Booker)
25	Section 3	Switch the order of 3.1.1.5.1 and 3.1.1.5.2. Use “-#” convention to delete and recreate in comments database.	BDM
26	Section 3	Decide with its simplified language whether 3.1.1.6.1 should be a future requirement. Recommend that it not be listed as future. Simplified language: “ACMS shall provide the capability to create and display viewable images.”	ACMS Task Force (probably Ney)
27	Section 6	Include notes in Section 6 on acceptability of including third party COTS viewers/browsers. See s6words.doc and refer to pdf notes for 3.1.1.6.5.	BDM
28	Glossary	Add definitions of interface and integration to Glossary. Refer to CIMdata Buyer’s Guide and ACMS Data Call. For the Data Call, Integration involved invoking selected ACMS functions from within the 3 rd party application. Interface involves launching a 3 rd party application from ACMS. Refer to pdf notes for 3.1.1.6.5.	BDM

Appendix B

Action Items Resulting from Meeting

Action No.	Action Category	Action Description	Actionee
29	Section 3	<p>Split 3.1.1.7.2.1 into the following two requirements.</p> <p>3.1.1.7.2.1</p> <p>Manage Distributed Data Environment</p> <p>ACMS shall provide the capability to maintain, coordinate, and synchronize a distributed data environment for metadata and documents that includes multiple sites, multiple servers, and multiple networks.</p> <p>3.1.1.7.2.1-1 (New)</p> <p>Manage Multiple Repositories and PDM Vaults</p> <p>ACMS shall provide the capability to maintain, coordinate, and synchronize multiple repositories and PDM systems.</p>	BDM
30	Section 3	<p>Confirm that 3.1.1.7.2.1 is to be split into two requirements. BDM-'s notes are contradictory on this matter. The split requirements would be:</p> <p>3.1.1.7.2.1 (old)</p> <p>Manage Distributed Data Environment</p> <p>ACMS shall provide the capability to maintain, coordinate, and synchronize a distributed data environment for metadata and documents that includes multiple sites, multiple servers, and multiple networks.</p> <p>3.1.1.7.2.1-1 (New)</p> <p>Manage Multiple Repositories and PDM Vaults</p> <p>ACMS shall provide the capability to maintain, coordinate, and synchronize multiple repositories and PDM systems.</p>	ACMS Task Force (probably Ney or Booker)
31	Section 6	<p>If splitting 3.1.1.7.2.1, confirm that the new requirement, 3.1.1.7.2.1-1, is a future requirement. BDM-'s notes indicate that this decision was to be made during the discussions on Section 6. This was not done.</p> <p>The issue is the ability to coordinate and synchronize multiple repositories, including JEDMICS and whether this should be a future requirement. This decision needs to be consistent with the timeframe for 3.2.1.19 and any other repositories identified in 3.2.1.</p>	ACMS Task Force (probably Ney or Booker)
32	Section 6	<p>No decision was made on whether interfaces between ACMS and JEDMICS should be current or future requirements. At this time, they are listed as current. Unless directed otherwise, they will remain current. This is our recommendation.</p> <p>See Actions 30, 31, and 32.</p>	ACMS Task Force (probably Ney or Booker)

Appendix B

Action Items Resulting from Meeting

Action No.	Action Category	Action Description	Actionee
33	Document	<p>Change to “electronic forms.” Search document for appropriate replacements. Note: Not every occurrence of “display” should be changed to “electronic form.”</p> <p>Be sure to check the following paragraphs: 3.1.1.7.4.5, A. 2.5, B. 1.2, B. 1.3, B. 1.4, B. 2.1.2, B. 2.1.2.1, B. and C. 3.4. Refer to comments against G-32. (incomplete list)</p>	BDM
34	Section 3	<p>Add the following requirement before requirement 3.1.1.7.5.1:</p> <p>Required Security Level</p> <p>ACMS shall provide Confidentiality, Integrity, Identification & Authentication, and Audit capabilities to be certified at a C2 security level. Proper procedures and configuration requirements will be identified to adequately protect Sensitive But Unclassified (SBU) data as defined by DoD and Department Army (DA).</p> <p>Try numbering as 3.1.1.7.5.0 in comments database.</p>	BDM
35	Section 3	<p>At the feb 98 mtg, requirement 3.1.2.5.3 was revised as follows:</p> <p>“ACMS shall provide the capability to create, assign, record, retrieve, and display the metadata and unique identifiers of engineering change actions, and retrieve and display variances to the configuration documentation and hardware or software. Examples of engineering change action metadata include originators, disposition and date of disposition.”</p> <p>At that time, Booker took the an action which I described as, “Make sure we have included the ability to keep the associated attachments.” Ed captured the action as, “Make sure one can view, ... documents associated with the engineering change action.</p> <p>Question: Would it be clearer to replace “configuration documentation and hardware and software” with “product data and product structure?”</p>	Booker
36	Section 3	Fix the concluding punctuation of requirement 3.1.2.5.3. Period instead of semicolon.	BDM
37	Section 3	Develop hierarchy for 12 Tech Loop requirements.	Ney

Appendix B

Action Items Resulting from Meeting

Action No.	Action Category	Action Description	Actionee
38	Section 3	<p>Apply the following substructure under Tech Loop:</p> <p>3.1.3.1 Tech Loop Creation and Maintenance</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Old Numbers: 3.1.3.1, 3.1.3.2, 3.1.3.3, 3.1.3.4, 3.1.3.10, 3.1.3.11, 3.1.3.12</p> <p>3.1.3.2 Support Tech Loop Reviews</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Old Numbers: 3.1.3.6, 3.1.3.7, 3.1.3.8, 3.1.3.9</p> <p>3.1.3.3 Generate Tech Loop Report</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Old Number: 3.1.3.5</p> <p>To implement this in the comments database, we will need to renumber the requirements. Will retain traceability via the Justification text.</p>	BDM
39	Document	Change tech loop to Tech Loop.	BDM
40	Acronym List	Change AMC/AMSC to Acquisition Method Code/Acquisition Method Suffix Code. See 3.1.3.2.	BDM
41	Section 3	Provide new language for 3.1.3.4 (Now 3.1.3.1-4). Current language is, "ACMS shall provide the capability to establish relationships and identify metadata about those relationships between Tech Loop actions and the results of the Tech Loop evaluation."	AMCOM
42	Section 3	<p>Create the following new requirement near the end of the requirements in 3.1.1.2.2:</p> <p>ACMS shall provide the capability to send system (including automatically generated event triggered messages) and user electronic messages to multiple recipients who may or may not be ACMS users.</p> <p>This is part of the resolution to 3.2.1.2. Keep the resolution text for 3.2.1.2 as it is shown after the feb 98 meeting.</p> <p>Placed after 3.1.1.2.2.8.</p>	BDM
43	Section 3	<p>Revise the parenthetical tailoring phrase for 3.2.1.5 and elsewhere as follows:</p> <p>(See Section 6.xxx. This requirement must be tailored by the implementing command at the time of acquisition.)</p> <p>Phrasing provided by pdf note for 3.4.1.1.</p>	BDM

Appendix B

Action Items Resulting from Meeting

Action No.	Action Category	Action Description	Actionee
44	Section 3 and Section 6	<p>Note that the parenthetical tailoring phrase will be used as a preliminary indicator that a requirement is an Enterprise-Wide requirement that must be tailored to conform to a site-unique environment. This means that it is really an Enterprise-Unique requirement.</p> <p>The Task Force needs to remember to update the use of these parenthetical phrases after completing its development of the tailoring table in Section 6.</p>	ACMS Task Force
45	Section 3	<p>Confirm the deletion of 3.2.1.4 and 3.2.1.6 as being completely covered by 3.2.1.8 through 3.2.1.20.</p> <p>Our notes are incomplete, but suggest they are to be deleted. Need to make sure a mistake wasn't made and that some interface requirements aren't lost.</p>	ACMS Task Force (probably Ney or Booker)
46	Section 6	<p>BDM- needs additional guidance regarding the instructions to consider adding the comment CIMdata provided for 3.2.1.7. It may be necessary to see our Section 6 proposal before reacting to this action.</p> <p>CIMdata's comments are provided below:</p> <p>"Additional details regarding the desire level of integration will be necessary before COTS vendor will be able to respond to these requirements. Outside of a generic ODBC driver to access commercial databases such as Oracle, COTS PDM systems will need to be interfaced or integrated with these external systems. The detailed specification for the integrations will need to be defined. It would be best if those integrations were standardized across the Army commands rather than each defining their own."</p> <p>1) Action 1 of this list of actions will result in a reminder that technical definitions of interfaces must be included in acquisition documentation. This could be expanded to state that detailed specifications also are needed for any integration of applications. Please inform us if you want this statement included.</p> <p>2) We do not anticipate saying anything about ODBC drivers in Section 6. If this is wrong, please instruct us on what is wanted.</p> <p>3) Regarding standardization of integration efforts across Army commands, I will describe a process where if two or more commands choose the same core PDM system and the interface with some of the same legacy systems, the should consider combining forces to develop standard interfaces.</p>	ACMS Task Force (probably Ney)
47	Acronym List	Add MEARS to Acronym List.	BDM
48	Section 3	Spell out MEARS in 3.2.1.8.	BDM

Appendix B

Action Items Resulting from Meeting

Action No.	Action Category	Action Description	Actionee
49	Section 3	Add the following additional interface after 3.2.1.17 (make it 3.2.1.17-1): “ACMS shall be capable of batch loading metadata from DODISS ACCESS.”	BDM
50	Acronym List	Add DODISS (Department of Defense Index of Specifications and Standards) to the Acronym List	BDM
51	Acronym List	Provide a definition of ACCESS in DODISS ACCESS.	Mike Cantrell
52	Section 3	Update type of interface with PASS in 3.2.1.21. Is it dynamic or batch? Currently shown as dynamic.	Gordon Ney
53	Acronym List	Add EDMD (Engineering Data Management Directorate) to Acronym List.	BDM
54	Section 6	Move 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 (user and administrator competency) to Section 6.	BDM
55	Section 6	Add a note in Section 6 to remind implementing organizations to add their specific catastrophic failure recovery requirements to the acquisition documents. Refer to pdf note for 3.3.6.	BDM
56	Section 3	See acmswork/perfspec/98feb26/ 338-1.doc for list of values for requirement 3.3.8-1 (old).	BDM
57	Section 6	Include reminder that technical definitions of specified reports must be included in acquisition documentation. See also Action 1, 14, 55, and possibly 27 and 46.	BDM
58	Section 3	Add the following sentence to the end of paragraph 3.4: “All of the following requirements must be tailored by the implementing command at the time of acquisition. See paragraph 62.4.” Do not use the parenthetical tailoring phrase for the 3.4 requirements.	BDM
59	Dropped		
60	Section 6	Add a note to section 6 that the implementing organization must provide a Government Concept of Operations (GCO) at the time of solicitation and that it may require updating at the time of installation. The GCO must be used to tailor the requirements under 3.4.	BDM
61	Acronym List	Add GCO (Government Concept of Operations) to Acronym List.	BDM
62	Section 6	Mark all of the 3.4 requirements in tailoring table with “()” in the Enterprise-Unique column.	BDM

Appendix B

Action Items Resulting from Meeting

Action No.	Action Category	Action Description	Actionee
63	Section 4	Evaluate the AMCOM and BDM- options for paragraph 4.1. Recommend which to use. At the meeting, TECOM recommended using and the Task Force agreed to use the AMCOM version, but modified by the AMSAA comment.	TECOM
64	Section 4	Incorporate the AMCOM version of paragraph 4.1, but modified to reflect the AMSAA comment against the BDM- version.	BDM
65	Section 4	Update the Section 4 Verification table to include the comment made against 4.2-1 and adjusted to reflect any changes during the feb 98 meeting, if appropriate. Note 3.2.3.1 is not to be Tested.	BDM
66	Section 6	Incorporate the AMSAA provided foreword, as modified by BDM-, into Section 6 (probably 6.1.2). There is to be no Foreword.	BDM
67	Section 5	Make Section 5 N/A. See resolution text language.	BDM
68	Glossary	Add the following definition of “electronic form” to the Glossary: A structured presentation of product data on a computer screen which is used to modify or enter that data.	BDM
69	Section 6	Provide tailoring instructions that explain (constrain) what the commands may tailor. Introduce the tailoring table with columns: Requirements, Enterprise-Wide, Enterprise-Unique, and Command-Unique.	BDM
70	Glossary	Define Enterprise-Wide, Enterprise-Unique, and Command-Unique in the Glossary. See Steno Pad notes. Check 961D for description of “ordering data” (relates to Enterprise-Unique). Note: Action 44.	BDM
71	Section 6	Develop the tailoring table. Place an “X” for each requirement in the Enterprise-Wide column. For those requirements with the tailoring parenthetical remark in Section 3 (to include all the requirements in 3.4), add “()” in the Enterprise-Unique column as an indicator that the “X” may shift left at least one column. See also Action 62.	BDM
72	Section 6	Review the tailoring table and, as a group, determine where to move the “X” indicators.	ACMS Task Force
73	Section 3	Update the tailoring parenthetical remarks in Section 3 to correspond with the final version of the tailoring table in Section 6.	ACMS Task Force

Appendix B

Action Items Resulting from Meeting

Action No.	Action Category	Action Description	Actionee
74	Section 4	<p>Add the following three requirements to Section 4 per TECOM's response to Action 63:</p> <p>"The contractor shall develop detailed test plans for each implementation site to verify that the requirements listed in Table ?? have been satisfied."</p> <p>"All contractor test plans shall be subject to Government approval."</p> <p>"The contractor shall allow and assist the Government in monitoring contractor testing."</p>	BDM
75	Dropped		
76	Concluding Material	Determine what organization is to be the responsible organization for the document.	Gordon Ney
77	Document	Review the structure and format of the document to ensure it complies with the standards of the assigned standardization office.	Assigned Standardization Office (See Action 76)
78	Section 1	Determine if it is acceptable to use a footnote as currently done in Section 1 (issue is not with the existence of a footnote, but that it is used to highlight information that is discussed later). Leave as a footnote for now.	Assigned Standardization Office (See Action 76)
79	Index	Develop an Index for the document. Include words/phrases that appear in the subject of paragraphs and requirements. Best guess other entries. Task Force wants an Index, since a TOC is not allowed. (a.k.a., an index of titles)	BDM
80	Glossary	Make sure Index words are defined in the Glossary.	BDM
81	Section 6	<p>Search January 98 comments database and document for Section 6 SOW reminders. Compile and send a list of SOW reminders found to Gordon Ney. Specifically, look for legacy conversion issues.</p> <p>[Visually scanned and then searched on Section 6, SOW, legacy, and a few other terms. Found 2 legacy conversions & 1 JEDMICS batch load statement.]</p>	BDM
82	Section 6	Post list of SOW reminders found as a result of Action 81 on web.	Gordon Ney
83	Section 6	Add a reminder in Section 6 that implementing organizations need to include legacy conversion requirements in their acquisition documentation.	BDM
84	Document	<p>Verify that "engineering data" is still used in the document after the redefinition of "product data." Refer to G-31.</p> <p>Yes, it is still used.</p>	BDM
85	Section 6	Make the JCALS interface requirement (3.2.1.18) a future requirement. See Steno Pad notes.	BDM
86	Glossary	Remove Glossary terms that are not used in the document.	BDM

Appendix B
Action Items Resulting from Meeting

Action No.	Action Category	Action Description	Actionee
87	Section 1	Make specific paragraph changes from feb 98 meeting as specified in Resolution text.	BDM
88	Section 2	Make specific paragraph changes from feb 98 meeting as specified in Resolution text.	BDM
89	Section 3	Make specific requirement changes from feb 98 meeting as specified in Resolution text.	BDM
90	Section 4	Make specific paragraph changes from feb 98 meeting as specified in Resolution text.	BDM
91	Section 5	Make specific paragraph changes from feb 98 meeting as specified in Resolution text.	BDM
92	Section 6	Make specific paragraph changes from feb 98 meeting as specified in Resolution text.	BDM
93	App A	Make specific paragraph changes from feb 98 meeting as specified in Resolution text.	BDM
94	App B	Make specific paragraph changes from feb 98 meeting as specified in Resolution text.	BDM
95	App C	Make specific paragraph changes from feb 98 meeting as specified in Resolution text.	BDM
96	App D	Make specific paragraph changes from feb 98 meeting as specified in Resolution text.	BDM
97	App E	Make specific paragraph changes from feb 98 meeting as specified in Resolution text.	BDM
98	Concluding Material	Make specific paragraph changes from feb 98 meeting as specified in Resolution text.	BDM
99	Form 1426	Make specific paragraph changes from feb 98 meeting as specified in Resolution text.	BDM